

City of Seattle

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Purpose of Checklist:

The State Environmental Policy Action (SEPA), chapter 43.21C RCW, requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making decisions. An environmental impact statement (EIS) must be prepared for all proposals with probable significant adverse impacts on the quality of the environment. The purpose of this checklist is to provide information to help you and the agency identify impacts from your proposal (and to reduce or avoid impacts from the proposal, if it can be done) and to help the agency decide whether an EIS is required.

Instructions for Applicants:

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Governmental agencies use this checklist to determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant, requiring preparation of an EIS. Answer the questions briefly, with the most precise information known, or give the best description you can.

You must answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. In most cases, you should be able to answer the questions from your own observations or project plans without the need to hire experts. If you really do not know the answer, or if a question does not apply to your proposal, write “do not know” or “does not apply.” Complete answers to the questions now may avoid unnecessary delays later.

Some questions ask about permanent regulations, such as zoning, shoreline, and landmark designations. Answer these questions if you can. If you have problems, the governmental agencies can assist you.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will help describe your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:

Complete this checklist for nonproject proposals, even though questions may be answered “does not apply.” In addition, complete the Supplemental Sheet for Nonproject Actions (part D).

For nonproject actions, the references in the checklist to the words “project”, “applicant,” and “property or site” should be read as “proposal,” “proposer,” and “affected geographic area,” respectively.

A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

2010 Seattle Land Use Code Omnibus Ordinance

2. Name of applicant:

City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development

3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:

City of Seattle
Department of Planning and Development (DPD)
700 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000
PO Box 34019
Seattle, Washington 98124-4019
Contact: Bill Mills, 684-8738

4. Date checklist prepared:

August 30, 2010

5. Agency requesting checklist:

City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development

6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):

City Council consideration is expected to begin in the third quarter of 2010.

7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.

DPD is responsible for maintaining the Land Use code on an ongoing basis to ensure the proper maintenance of its provisions. Omnibus or maintenance ordinances will be prepared on an ongoing basis.

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.

The information provided in this checklist.

- 9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.**

The legislation would apply citywide where development permit applications are ongoing. The legislation primarily addresses administrative issues and makes only minor alterations to the meaning, application, and intent of current Land Use Code provisions in order to clarify their application.

- 10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.**

Approval by Seattle City Council and Mayor as amendments to Seattle's Land Use Code.

- 11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the site of the project. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)**

This proposal involves many small amendments to the Land Use Code that are intended to clarify current provisions or to correct minor oversights and clerical or typographical errors. The ordinance includes changes to the following sections:

23.04.010 Applicability – Transition to the Land Use Code

The proposed amendment to subsection 23.04.010.B would clarify that property use and development agreements (PUDA) adopted as part of a contract rezone under former Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) Title 24, the Zoning Code of 1957, may be released by the City Council without following the PUDA amendment procedures of Section 23.76.058.B.2, if a property owner of land subject to a Title 24 rezone and PUDA chooses to develop the property under current Title 23 regulations.

23.22.064 Subdivisions – Review of Final Plat – Filing with Director of Transportation

23.22.074 Subdivisions – Review of Final Plat – Council Determination of Final Plat

23.22.078 Subdivisions – Review of Final Plat – Resubmission

A change to Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 58.17.170 adopted by the State Legislature and effective on June 10, 2010, extends the period in which lots in full subdivisions are vested to local zoning regulations in effect at the time of recording of the plat from five years to seven years. The proposed amendments to 23.22.064, 23.22.074, and 23.22.078 would change the time limits in the Land Use Code that parallel the state requirements from five years to seven years.

23.40.002 Conformity With Regulations Required

The proposed change would clarify that approval of establishment or change of use of any structures, buildings, or premises pursuant to the Land Use Code does not apply to uses entirely within a right-of-way.

23.41.004 Early Project Implementation - Applicability

The proposed changes would add the Pike Market Mixed (PMM) zone outside the Pike Market Historical District to the list of Downtown zones in which design review is required and eliminate references to monorail transit facilities as exempt from design review.

23.42.040 General Use Provisions – Intermittent and temporary uses

The proposed amendment to Section 23.42.040.C would change the term of temporary use permits from a maximum of six months to a maximum of one year.

23.42.050 General Use Provisions – Home Occupations

The proposed amendment is to clarify that home occupation sign standards are controlled by the specific requirements for signs in each zone as set forth in the Sign Code, SMC Chapter 23.55. The current home occupation language only cross references the sign code standards for single-family zones, but home occupations occur in all other zones as well.

23.42.106 General Use Provisions – Expansion of Nonconforming Uses

Subsection 23.42.106.F regulates existing cemeteries as nonconforming uses. The proposed amendment would clarify that structures accessory to cemeteries, such as

mausoleums, crematoriums, and administrative offices may be added in conformity with the development standards for institutional uses in the applicable zone in which the cemetery is located.

23.42.112.A – General Use Provisions - Nonconformity to Development Standards

Section 23.42.112.A.1 is proposed to be amended to clarify that the height exception for a structure nonconforming to yard standards in a Single Family zone, to allow the minimum ceiling height for habitability in a basement or other floor, is available only to principal structures such as single family residences and not for accessory structures such as garages or sheds. A second proposed amendment would add a new subsection 23.42.112.A.2 to allow addition of new or replacement of existing mechanical equipment, such as a heating or air conditioning unit, on a nonconforming structure, even if the equipment is slightly larger or taller than previous equipment. Under the current Code language, new mechanical equipment is allowed as replacement for existing equipment performing the same or similar functions under the exception for structural alterations “as otherwise required by law, but the proposed language would allow a specific Code exception for all mechanical equipment. A third proposed amendment would add a new subsection 23.42.112.A.6 for light poles, such as for athletic field lighting, that exceed the zone height limit and that are located in parks, to allow existing poles to be moved and/or replaced in kind with new poles, without requiring Council approval. Additional new poles would not be allowed.

23.42.122 – General Use Provisions – Height Nonconformity

The proposed amendment would clarify that minor additions (dormers, eaves, and clerestories) may be constructed on pitched roofs above the height limit only on principal structures in single family and multifamily zones, and not on accessory structures such as garages.

23.44.008.I – Single Family – Development Standards for Uses Permitted Outright – Tree requirements

This amendment would exclude submerged land from the lot area used to calculate tree preservation and tree planting requirements.

23.44.010.B – Single Family - Lot Requirements – Exceptions to Minimum Lot Area

The proposed amendment would reorganize the existing provisions for exceptions to minimum lot area requirements. For example, under the current provisions, subsection 23.44.010.B.5 appears to provide a fifth exception to the minimum lot area standard. However, current subsection B.5 is intended as a limitation to the various exceptions. Therefore, it would be moved and listed in a separate subsection from the categories of lot area exceptions.

The amendments proposed to this section also would clarify the first exception and add the common name of the exception, “the Seventy-Five/Eighty (75/80) Rule,” to the Code. Other proposed amendments applicable to the 75/80 rule:

- 1) state that the Director has authority to determine the extent of a block face where platting patterns are irregular.
- 2) clarify that a lot can qualify as a separate development site under the 75/80 Rule through approval of a short plat or building permit, and the determination of how the 75/80 rule applies to the lot will be made based on the facts existing at the time of application. Absent such a provision, a lot might not qualify for the 75/80 Rule if development occurs elsewhere on the block face after an application, and a development might be made infeasible late in the process of site acquisition and permitting.

Two new exceptions are added at 23.44.010.B.1.e and B.1.f for lots within a clustered housing planned development, planned residential development, or within a development approved through an environmentally critical areas conditional use, as well as for a lot created by short subdivision of property developed with more than one existing single family dwelling unit.

23.44.012.C – Single Family – Height Limit – Exemptions

The proposed amendments to subsection 23.44.012.C.2 would change the wording of the exemptions from height standards for open rails and planters in Single Family development to make the language closer to the language for multifamily development in Section 23.45.009.D.2. A further change to the same subsection would clarify that green roof systems would be allowed 24 inches of additional height above the base height limit to accommodate a sturdier structure that might be needed to support the soil for a green roof system.

A proposed new subsection 23.44.012.C.6 would allow devices for generating wind power to be added to the roofs of structures in Single Family zones up to 10 feet above the maximum height limit and subject to a 15 percent rooftop coverage limit.

23.44.014.D.12, D.14, and D.17 – Single Family – Yards – Exceptions

Subsection D of 23.44.014 contains a number of exceptions to the basic development standards for front, rear, and side yards set forth in subsections A, B and C.

A proposed change to subsection 23.44.014.D.12 would clarify that this particular exception for development in yards applies to mechanical equipment in general, not just heat pumps, and would also specifically include any charging devices for electric car batteries, to the extent that a separate mechanical device would be needed for this purpose.

A change to subsection 23.44.014.D.14 is proposed to clarify that the exception allowing portions of structures more than eight feet above grade to project into the required front yard on lots that are 30 feet wide or less applies only if the structure is conforming to the front yard requirement at ground level (eight feet or less above grade).

A proposed new subsection 23.44.014.D.17 would allow cisterns for the collection of rainwater runoff to be located in required yards, subject to restrictions on overall container size, height, setback from lot lines, and coverage limits within required yards.

23.44.016 Single Family – Parking Location

A proposed change to 23.44.016.C.3 would clarify that the standard limiting the number of cars that can be parked outside on single family lots is limited to lots developed with one single family residence, as it does not make sense to impose this limit for nonresidential uses, such as institutions, or to lots developed with more than one dwelling unit, either because of legalization as nonconforming uses or in a cluster development authorized in Single-Family zones, such as a Clustered Housing Planned Development or a cluster development approved under the Regulations for Environmentally Critical Areas. A second change, to subsection 23.44.016.D.3, corrects a mistake in the 2009 Omnibus Ordinance 123046 that inadvertently prohibited parking in required side yards, when the intent was only to prohibit garages in side yards.

23.44.022 Single Family – Institutions

The proposed amendment would clarify that Subsection 23.44.022.D.4, which allows institutions constrained by the development standards of single-family zoning to apply for reclassification to Major Institution status, only applies to institutions that are eligible to be classified as Major Institutions (post-secondary schools and hospitals).

23.44.041 Single Family – Accessory Dwelling Units

The proposed amendments would clarify measurement of maximum structure height in relation to lot width as shown Table B for 23.44.041 by eliminating gaps that appear in the current table for determining lot width, and also make other minor corrections.

23.45.518 Multifamily – Setbacks and Separations in Midrise and Highrise zones

An incorrect cross reference to regulations for solar collectors in 23.45.518.G.5 would be corrected.

23.45.520 Multifamily – Highrise zone Width and Floor Size Limits

An incorrect cross reference would be changed in 23.45.520.B.

23.47A.012 Commercial – Structure Height

Ordinance 123215 (amending the Seattle Mixed zone standards in South Lake Union) amended Section 23.48.010, in part to add a new subsection D. The subsections previously labeled 23.48.010.D and .E became .E and .F. There are two cross references to the newly labeled 23.48.010.E and F, in sections 23.47A.012 and 23.48.016. The cross references were not updated in Ord. 123215 and are thus proposed to be updated here. An outdated reference to a height limit exception for monorail transit facilities is also proposed to be deleted.

23.47A.014.B.3 – Commercial – Setback Requirements

The current regulation is not clear whether a setback is required for a structure containing a residential use when the side lot line of commercial property is along an alley and the opposite side of the alley is residentially zoned. The Code only requires a setback along a rear lot line that is across an alley from a residential zone. The proposed amendment would require a setback along any side or rear lot line that abuts a lot in a residential zone or is across an alley from a lot in a residential zone.

23.47A.016.A – Commercial – Landscaping and Screening Standards

An amendment is proposed to clarify applicability of Green Factor requirements. A “substantial addition,” as well as “any new structure,” with over 4,000 square feet of nonresidential uses, would trigger landscaping and Green Factor requirements.

23.47A.032 – Commercial – Parking Location and Access

Several amendments are proposed as follows:

1) Under existing 23.47A.032.A.3, structures in C zones with residential uses or across a street from residential zones are subject to the parking and access standards for NC zones in 23.47A.032.A.1. If a lot does not abut an alley, and abuts only one street, only one two-way curb cut is allowed from the street. An issue arises if there are two buildings on one site, and one of them has residential uses. The proposed amendment would clarify that two or more buildings on a site are limited to one curb cut. A further proposed amendment would reconcile potentially conflicting standards for curb cuts in Sections 23.47A.032 and 23.54.030.F, which has separate standards for curb cuts, by directing that the standards in Section 23.54.030.F control in the event of conflict.

2) Subsection 23.47A.032.B.3 now says in part that structures with residential uses in C zones and structures in C zones across the street from residential zones shall meet the requirements for parking location for NC zones as provided in subsection 23.47A.032.B.1. Subsection B.1 prohibits parking between a structure and a street lot line. If the site is bordered on all sides by streets and a new building is proposed directly across the street from a residential zone, the proposed amendment would specify that parking is to be located behind the building. The proposed amendment would allow parking to be provided between a street and a structure, but only on sides facing other commercially-zoned lots.

23.48.010 Seattle Mixed – General Structure Height

The existing language in Section 23.48.010.A inadvertently omitted reference to the 125-foot height limit. The proposed amendment adds that reference.

23.48.016 Seattle Mixed – Standards Applicable to Specific Area

Incorrect cross references in subsection 23.48.016.C.5 are proposed to be fixed, as well as some other minor stylistic corrections.

23.48.034 Seattle Mixed – Parking and Loading Location, Access and Curbcuts

The existing Code, in Section 23.48.034.C.2, allows access to parking and loading from a street instead of an alley for lots that front on both an alley and an east/west oriented street. The proposed amendment, to Section 23.48.034.C.2, would allow the access from a street only where the alley is not improved or if use of the alley would create a significant safety hazard.

23.48.036 Seattle Mixed – Pet Daycare Centers

A new Code Section 23.48.036 is proposed to regulate pet daycare centers in Seattle Mixed zones. The language is the same as for existing Code section 23.50.049, for pet daycare centers in Industrial zones.

23.49.008 Downtown Zoning – Structure Height

The current Code, at Section 23.49.008.D.2.a.5), allows mechanical equipment to extend up to 15 feet above the applicable height limit. The proposed amendment, inadvertently deleted from the Code by a previous amendment, would allow mechanical equipment to extend 15 feet above the roof elevation of a structure existing prior to June 1, 1989, as well, where that structure is nonconforming to the current height limit. A new subsection 23.49.008.D.2.a.6) would allow wind turbines to have the additional 15 feet above the height limit allowed for other similar rooftop features such as mechanical equipment and solar collectors.

23.49.020 Downtown Zoning – Demonstration of LEED Silver Rating

The proposed amendment would change the time limit for compliance by a developer with a commitment to earn a LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) Silver rating for a structure as a condition of a permit from 90 days to 180 days, as application review for LEED certification from the U. S. Green Building Council or other independent entity typically requires more time than 90 days.

Sections 23.49.056 Downtown Zoning – Downtown Office Core 1, Downtown Office Core 2, and Downtown Mixed Commercial Street Façade and Street Setback Requirements

The amendments would change incorrect references to subsection 23.49.056.G, which does not exist, to subsection 23.49.056.F and add subsection 23.49.056.E, regulating street trees, which was inadvertently deleted from the Code by previous amendments to Section 23.49.056 that rearranged several subsections of Section 23.49.056 (Ordinances 121477 and 122054). A number of minor typographical errors would also be corrected.

Sections 23.49.166 Downtown Zoning – Downtown Mixed Residential, Side Setback and Green Street Setback Requirements

An incorrect cross reference in 23.49.166.B to Map 1G in the maps for downtown zoning at the end of Chapter 23.49 would be corrected to Map 1F.

23.50.012 – Industrial – Permitted and Prohibited Uses

In 23.50.012.D, the current standard for rooftop recreational space in IG1 and IG2 zones appears to limit rooftop recreational space to structures existing as of December 31, 1998. The language is proposed to be amended to clarify that the intent was to prohibit rooftop decks or other recreational space only in circumstances where they would not otherwise be allowed, such as for industrial structures above the maximum height limit for office structures in an Industrial zone, but was not meant to preclude construction of decks on newer or smaller office structures, if development standards are otherwise met.

23.50.024 – Industrial – Structure Height

References in Section 23.50.038.A to height exceptions for monorail transit facilities are proposed to be deleted.

23.50.038 – Industrial – General Commercial – Screening and Landscaping

The proposed amendment changes existing subsection 23.50.038.C to 23.50.038.B, so it is in the proper alphabetical order.

23.53.005 Requirements for Streets, Alleys, and Easements – Access to Lots

The amendment would change subsection 23.53.005.A.3 to clarify that lots developed with nonresidential uses or live-work units need not have a lot line of sufficient width abutting a street, alley, or easement to provide vehicular access to the lot if that lot does not have parking located on it, if a pedestrian access easement is provided instead. A further change would clarify that nonresidential uses or live-work units that do provide parking may have frontage on an improved alley as an alternative to street or easement frontage if, again, pedestrian access is provided instead.

23.53.015 Requirements for Streets, Alleys, and Easements – Improvement requirements for existing streets in residential and commercial zones

Proposed change to subsection 23.53.015.D.2.b would give DPD more discretion to decide when projects with reduced street improvement requirements are subject to those requirements. A change to 23.53.015.D.2.b.1.v, which currently technically requires street improvements, but not right of way dedications, for remodeling and use changes within existing structures, would clarify that street and alley improvements are required only if additional parking will be served by the street or alley or if changes to use or interior remodels would be likely to result in increased traffic.

23.53.020 Requirements for Streets, Alleys, and Easements – Improvement requirements for existing streets in industrial zones

A proposed change to subsection 23.53.020.E.2.e, which currently technically requires street improvements, but not right of way dedications, for remodeling and use changes within existing structures, would clarify that street improvements are required only if additional parking will be served by the street or if changes to use or interior remodels would be likely to result in increased traffic. This proposed amendment is the same as

the one for subsection 23.53.015.D.2.b.1.v for structures in residential and commercial zones.

23.53.025 Requirements for Streets, Alleys, and Easements – Access Easement Standards

A proposed change to subsection 23.53.025.A.1 would clarify that minimum width standards for vehicle access easements serving one or two single family residences, or one duplex, which are now either ten feet or 12 feet if required by the Fire Chief, may be required to be wider as needed to accommodate a driveway that is required to be wider than ten or 12 feet.

A second proposed change would amend subsection 23.53.025.C.2, which requires single family structures to be set back five feet from an easement, to allow the same exceptions for projections of structures into setbacks from easements that are allowed for projections into yards fronting on streets.

23.53.030 Requirements for Streets, Alleys, and Easements – Alley improvements in all zones

The proposed change to subsection 23.53.030.E.1.a.5, which currently requires alley improvements for remodeling and use changes within existing structures, would clarify that alley improvements are required only if additional parking will be served by the street or if changes to use or interior remodels would be likely to result in increased traffic.

23.54.015 Quantity and Design Standards for Access and Off-street Parking – Required Parking

A proposed amendment to Section 23.54.015.B.3 would fix a confusing cross-reference to the Northgate Overlay District requirements for parking, to clarify that the requirements of Chapter 23.54 apply in Northgate, just as they do everywhere else in the City, except as modified by Section 23.71.016.

Proposed amendments to Section 23.54.015.D.1, 23.54.015.D.2 and Table D for Section 23.54.015 would change parking requirements for performing arts theaters to be closer to the requirements for movie theaters.

A proposed amendment to subsection 23.54.015.G would clarify that the waiver of up to 20 parking spaces for new nonresidential uses in existing structures is available only if a new or expanded use increases the amount of parking required. Thus, if the new use reduces total required parking, but required parking spaces are currently in existence and provided, the waiver is not available to reduce or eliminate the existing required parking.

23.54.030 Quantity and Design Standards for Access and Off-street Parking – Parking Space Standards

The proposed change to 23.54.030.A.7 would clarify that the additional minimum width required for a parking space next to a property line is only required for parking spaces parallel to the line, since the additional width is to allow for a car door to open without crossing a property line, and this problem is not presented by parking spaces perpendicular to a property line.

The proposed change to subsection 23.54.030.F.2.a.1 would clarify that the standards for numbers of curbcuts for nonresidential uses in residential zones, including institutions and various types of permitted businesses, particularly in Midrise and Highrise zones, are regulated by this subsection, which previously specifically applied only to Residential/Commercial (RC) zones and to Major Institution Overlay Districts, while all other subsections of 23.54.030.F.2 also failed to mention nonresidential uses in residential zones.

Section 23.54.030.G generally requires “sight triangles,” or small clear areas adjacent to each side of an access driveway or easement, to allow vehicles to safely enter and exit. A proposed change to subsection 23.54.030.G.6 would allow mirrors or light/sound signals to substitute for sight triangles in Industrial, Commercial1, and Commercial 2 zones, just as they are now allowed in Downtown zones.

23.54.035 Quantity and Design Standards for Access and Off-street Parking – Loading Berth Requirements and Space Standards

A proposed change to Section 23.54.035.B.2 clarifies the name of the South Lake Union Urban Center, which is referred to in the current Code as South Lake Union Hub Urban Village.

23.55.024 Signs – Signs in Residential Commercial (RC) Zones

[Dick Alford needs to provide input on what change is needed here, if any.]

23.55.028 Signs in NC1 and NC2 Zones

23.55.030 Signs in NC3, C1, C2 and SM Zones

The current language of subsections 23.55.028.D.2 and 23.55.030.E.2 allows individual businesses to have various types of on-premises signs in the respective zones, and “multiple business centers” such as shopping malls or downtown highrises may have one sign identifying the multiple business center for each 300 lineal feet of street frontage, but multiple businesses within a single structure or development cannot have a signage listing all the businesses within the center. The proposed amendments would allow “multiple business centers” containing a number of business establishments to have a choice of various types of signage listing all the businesses. Also, the term “use,” appearing throughout these subsections would be changed to “business establishment” to clarify that the sign standards apply to businesses rather than uses. The subsections are also slightly reorganized for clarity.

23.55.036 Signs – Signs in IB, IC, IG1 and IG2 Zones

A proposed change to 23.55.036.D.1 would delete the term “properly displayed” from subsection D.1.d allowing national, state and institutional flags as on-premises signs, as the City has no authority to determine whether a flag is “properly” displayed. The phrase was eliminated from all other sections of the Sign Code by the 2009 Omnibus amendments (Ord. 123046) but Section 23.55.036 was overlooked by the previous amendments.

The proposed amendments to subsection 23.55.036.D.2 would allow “multiple business centers” containing a number of business establishments to have a choice of various types of signage listing all the businesses, similar to the amendments for Sections 23.55.028, 23.55.030, and 23.55.034 discussed above. Also, the term “use” would be changed to “business establishment” to clarify that the sign standards apply to businesses rather than uses, and the subsection is slightly reorganized for clarity.

23.57.002 Communication Regulations – Scope and Applicability of Provisions

The proposed amendment changes an incorrect cross reference in Section 23.57.002.D from 23.69.006.A to 23.69.006.B.

23.57.010 Communication Regulations – Single Family and Residential Small Lot Zones

A proposed change to subsection 23.57.010.C.1.a would clarify that establishment or expansion of a minor communication utility does not require administrative conditional use approval if proposed as an addition to an existing freestanding major or minor communication tower, since 23.57.010.A.2 already allows minor communication utilities outright if locating on existing towers.

A proposed change to subsection 23.57.010.C.2.f would clarify that a personal wireless facility that would be either the third or any subsequent utility on the same lot must meet the criteria for location of a minor communication utility set forth in Section 23.57.009.A. The current Code reads like only the third separate utility is subject to 23.57.009.A.

A proposed change to subsection 23.57.010.E.5 would delete incorrect cross references to development standards subject to waiver under this subsection, which applies if implementing the standards would cause reception window obstruction for an accessory communications device or minor communications utility.

23.57.013 Communication Regulations – Downtown Zones

Minor grammatical changes are proposed.

23.69.024 Major Institution Overlay District – Major Institution Designation

23.69.030 Major Institution Overlay District – Contents of a Master Plan

23.69.032 Major Institution Overlay District – Master Plan Process

Incorrect cross references in Sections 23.69.024.B.7, 23.69.030.E.11, and 23.69.032.D.1 to the “purpose and intent” section of the major institution chapter are proposed to be changed from 23.69.006 to 23.69.002.

23.71.016 Northgate Overlay District – Parking and Access

The proposed change would clarify that pet daycares in existence as specified in Section 23.47A.039 may continue in operation even if nonconforming to parking requirements of the Northgate Overlay District.

23.76.004 Procedures for Master Use Permits and Council Land Use Decisions – Land Use Decision Framework

A proposed change to Section 23.76.004.E would clarify that procedural requirements for certain land use decisions that are not listed in Table A for 23.76.004 or elsewhere in Chapter 23.76 may be prescribed elsewhere in either the Land Use Code or in another title of the Municipal Code.

23.76.006 Procedures for Master Use Permits and Council Land Use Decisions – Master Use Permits Required

Subsection 23.76.006.C.2.k, referring to establishment of monorail transit facilities as a decision subject to appeal to the Hearing Examiner, is proposed to be deleted, since the monorail construction program itself is no longer proposed.

23.76.010 Procedures for Master Use Permits and Council Land Use Decisions – Applications for Master Use Permits

Ordinance 121476 deleted an application submittal requirement from subsection 23.76.010.D requiring verification from applicants that required notification signs were installed according to DPD specifications, as DPD had taken over all sign installation duties. The proposed amendment would restore this requirement to the Code, as DPD is once again requiring applicants to post their own signs for new projects that require signs.

23.76.026 Procedures for Master Use Permits and Council Land Use Decisions – Vesting of Development Rights

The first proposed amendment would clarify Section 23.76.026.B.2, regulating the vesting of development rights for design review components of Master Use Permits, to specify that if there are multiple early design guidance meetings, it is the date of the last or most recent meeting that controls, and only a maximum of 90 days can pass between meetings or the whole process must begin anew.

The second proposed amendment would delete current subsections D and E, as they relate to implementation of Ordinance 118466, which adopted a temporary moratorium on development in landslide-prone Environmentally Critical Areas in 1997, and has since been repealed. Since the ordinance to which subsections D and E relate has been repealed, these subsections should also be deleted.

23.76.058 Procedures for Master Use Permits and Council Land Use Decisions – Rules for Specific Decisions

A new subsection 23.76.058.B.2.c is proposed to clarify that the provisions for amending property use and development agreements (PUDA's) recorded as part of a contract rezone apply only to PUDA's adopted under the current Land Use Code, Seattle Municipal Code Title 23, and do not apply to PUDA's adopted under former Title 24 (Seattle Zoning Code of 1957) that may still be in effect.

23.76.066 Procedures for Master Use Permits and Council Land Use Decisions – Shoreline Master Program Amendments

The proposed amendment deletes reference to a repealed state regulation, WAC 173-19-060, and simply changes the language to state that amendments to the Shoreline Code become effective according to state law, to avoid the need to cross-reference a specific regulation or statute in the future.

23.80.004 Essential Public Facilities – Review Criteria

Subsection 23.80.004.D, regulating monorail transit facilities, is proposed to be deleted, as the monorail construction program itself is no longer proposed.

23.84A.010 Definitions “E”- Essential Public Facilities

The proposed amendment would remove a reference to monorail transit systems.

23.84A.016 Definitions “H” – Household

A proposed change to the definition of “household” would clarify that the number of persons receiving care in an adult family home as allowed by state law are permitted there in addition to the number of related and non-related persons who comprise the regular household within a dwelling unit.

23.84A.024 Definitions “L” – Laboratory, Research and Development; Land Use Information Bulletin

The first proposed change would clarify the definition of “research and development laboratory” by specifically stating that such laboratories include those subject to biosafety containment standards described by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, *Biosafety in Microbiological and Biomedical Laboratories*, current edition.

The second proposed amendment would add a definition of “land use information bulletin,” which is the DPD publication that provides written public notice for land use projects and other agency actions requiring notice to the public. The definition simply cross references to the definition of “general mailed release,” which is already in the Code.

23.84A.025 Definitions “M” – Monorail Guideway, Monorail Transit Facility, Monorail Transit Station, Monorail Transit System

All definitions referring to the monorail program are proposed to be deleted.

23.84A.036 Definitions “S” – Sales and Services, Automotive; Sign, Multiple Business Center

The definition of “retail sales and services, automotive,” is proposed to be amended to clarify that battery exchange stations for electric vehicles are to be included among the types of uses regarded as automotive retail sales and service uses.

A new definition for “multiple business center sign” is proposed to clarify that multiple business centers, such as shopping malls and downtown buildings, may have on-premises signage listing all the businesses within a multiple business center, but not specific products or services offered by the individual businesses.

23.84A.038 Definitions “T” – Transportation facility, Parking and Moorage, Principal Use Parking

The definition of “principal use parking” is proposed to be amended to clarify that battery charging stations and rapid charging stations for electric vehicles are to be considered accessory to parking facilities.

23.84A.048 Definitions “Z” – Zone

Proposed fixes to the definitions of “zone, lowrise,” “zone, multifamily,” “zone, residential,” and “zone, single family,” are proposed to clarify that the RC (Residential Commercial) designation is a separate type of zone, not a suffix, and a new definitions of “zone, residential-commercial, is proposed to clarify that the RC zone is a residential zone classification.

23.86.006 Measurements – Structure Height

A proposed change to subsection 23.86.006.A would clarify the name of the South Lake Union Urban Center, which is still erroneously referred to as the South Lake Union Hub Urban Village by the current Code language.

23.88.010 Rules: Interpretation – Rulemaking

The proposed change would add a new Section 23.88.010.B to give the Director authority to update, by rule, the standards for determining whether a proposed new structure has earned one of the various ratings for “green” building. The authority to establish the standard by rule would remove the need to update various Code sections that refer to the green building standards.

23.88.020 Rules: Interpretation – Land Use Interpretations

A change to subsection 23.88.020.A would specifically state that interpretations may affect Type I and Type II land use decisions by affirming, reversing, or modifying these decisions. The change is needed to specify that interpretations are an appealable administrative remedy that must be obtained before a Type I decision, in particular, can be appealed to State Superior Court.

A second change, to subsection 23.88.020.B, would change the language to state that interpretations must be filed with DPD accompanied by the “required” fee, instead of cross-referencing a specific section of the fee ordinance, so that the Code section will be less likely to become outdated.

23.91.004 Citation – Hearings – Penalties – Citation

A change is proposed to specify that a citation shall contain notice that the person cited must respond to the citation within 15 days rather than 18 days as stated in the current language, to make the section consistent with all other time limits in Chapter 23.91.

23.05.675 State Environmental Policy Act – Specific Environmental Policies

A change to 25.05.675.M.2.c is proposed to correct a cross reference to Map B for 23.45.015, which should instead read as Map B for 23.54.015.

Columbia City Station Area Overlay District Boundary Revision (Rezone)

In 2001 the City Council adopted Ordinance 120561 that applied the Station Area Overlay District (SAOD) to an area around the Columbia City (Edmunds) Link Light Rail Station. The overlay was applied to the multifamily and commercial zoned land generally within ¼ mile of the light rail station on either side of Martin Luther King Jr. Way S. The boundaries followed street center lines or zone boundaries. At the time the Seattle Housing Authority’s Rainier Vista property had not been redeveloped. S. Columbian Way and S. Oregon Street were used as the northern boundary of the overlay. These streets are more than a block south of the ¼ mile distance otherwise used to draw SAOD boundaries. The street layout has been changed to reintroduce the grid pattern of the surrounding area street system and a new street, S. Genesee Street now exists at a point that is closer the ¼ mile mark. The area proposed to be included within the SAOD meets the rezone criteria for relocating a SAOD boundary.

United Grocers Rezone correction to text and official land use map.

The Official Land Use Map, Section 23.32.016, Page 189, is amended to change the zone classification of the designated area from an erroneous designation, as set forth in Seattle City Ordinance 123086, of IC/U-85 to Industrial Commercial with an 85-foot height limit (IC/85).

Goodwill Industries Rezone official land use map correction

Ordinance 122918 rezoned property at 1400 South Dearborn Street from IC/65 (Industrial Commercial with a 65-foot height limit) to NC3/85 (Neighborhood Commercial 3 with an 85-foot height limit) but made the rezone contingent on a street vacation that was not approved. Since the street vacation was not approved, the rezone never became effective. However, the official land use map was changed to show the NC3/85 designation. In this situation, the appropriate process for correcting the map is a

Type V Council approval to correct the map, per SMC Section 23.76.036. The property reverts to the prior zoning, IC/65.

- 12. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist.**

The proposed amendments apply to areas throughout the city of Seattle.

**TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT: EVALUATION FOR
AGENCY USE ONLY**

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

This is not a project; therefore no direct impacts from this proposal are anticipated.

1. Earth

a. General description of the site (circle one):

**Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous,
other: _____**

The earth characteristics for the location of development vary significantly throughout the City of Seattle. The proposed amendments would not increase the potential for earth impacts.

b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?

See a. above.

c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any prime farmland.

Soils conditions vary considerably throughout the City and typically include a mix of glacial till found in the urban Seattle area. No agricultural soil or prime/unique farmland is present in the City.

d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.

Some areas within the City of Seattle feature unstable soils. Soil conditions vary from site to site, and would be evaluated accordingly.

e. Describe the purpose, type, and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.

Many developable sites within Seattle are composed of unstable soils. However, the proposed amendments are programmatic, not site-specific.

f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.

The potential for erosion is site-specific and would need to be evaluated on a project-by-project basis. The proposed amendments would not result in increased development.

g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction activity. Individual projects may undergo SEPA review on a site-specific basis.

h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:

This is a non-project action. Development consistent with this proposal may occur over time and cannot be evaluated in terms of erosion at this stage. Such projects will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as subsequent environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

2. Air

a. What type of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e., dust, automobile, odors, industrial wood smoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.

This is a non-project action and no changes to odor standards are proposed. Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions have also been considered, and no changes to GHG emissions are expected as a result of this non-project action. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review) and existing odor and emissions requirements currently contained in the Land Use Code and promulgated by the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency as they move forward. A SEPA GHG Emissions Worksheet is required for all individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal.

b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.

None that are known.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

3. Water

a. Surface:

1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.

The City of Seattle features freshwater lakes, streams, and saltwater bodies. Major bodies of water include Lake Washington, Lake Union, the Duwamish River, and Puget Sound. The proposed amendments are not expected to result in increased impacts on water quality.

2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.

None. The proposed amendments are not site-specific.

4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

No. The proposed amendments are not site-specific.

5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.

No. The proposal is not site-specific. However, parts of Seattle are located within 100-year floodplains.

6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.

No. This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

b. Ground:

1) Will ground water be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to ground water? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

No. The proposed amendments are not site-specific.

2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals ...; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.

The entire city of Seattle is served by a sewage system, generally sewer mains. The proposed legislation will not change existing regulations on septic tanks or waste material discharge.

c. Water Runoff (including storm water):

1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, or runoff water impacts, if any:

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

4. Plants

a. Check or circle types of vegetation found on the site:

- X deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other**
- X evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other**
- X shrubs**
- X grass**
- X pasture**
- X crop or grain**
- X wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other**
- X water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other**
- X other types of vegetation**

Citywide application: each of these features exists within the city limits to a limited extent.

b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

c. List threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

5. Animals

a. Circle any birds and animals that have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:

The area is developed and urban in character. Future proposals may be evaluated for their impact on animals.

b. List any threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

The proposal is not expected to impact threatened or endangered species. Chinook salmon in Puget Sound are listed as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act. Bald Eagles are known to exist within the city limits. No impacts to any species are expected as a result of implementing this proposal.

c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

6. Energy and Natural Resources

a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.

Areas within the City of Seattle are served by electric and natural gas utilities. Future development is likely to use these sources of energy.

b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

7. Environmental Health

a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Future development projects may be subject to environmental review, the City's Environmentally Critical Areas Ordinance, and other requirements. Future development projects will need to comply with project-specific environmental regulations. Zoning or development regulation changes in the proposed legislation are unlikely to result in environmental health hazards as part of the site development for an individual project.

1) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

As a non-project action, no emergency services are required by this amendment. In general, emergency service providers including the Fire and Police Departments will review the effects of increased development and propose enhanced services as necessary as part of their planning for future service needs.

2) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

This is a non-project action. Future development cannot be evaluated in terms of measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards at this stage.

b. Noise

1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment operation, other)?

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from site.

This proposal is a non-project action. As such, noise levels would not be directly affected.

3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

8. Land and Shoreline Use

a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties?

This proposal is not site-specific.

b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe.

The implementation of this proposal is not expected to impact land previously used for agricultural purposes as the proposal is not site-specific. Future projects may be evaluated for such impacts in the future.

c. Describe any structures on the site.

This proposal is not site-specific.

d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?

No.

e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?

This proposal applies to zones throughout the city of Seattle.

f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?

The proposal applies to all comprehensive plan designations throughout the city.

g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?

No changes are proposed to the shoreline master program. The proposal applies to all shoreline areas throughout the city. Where there are differences or inconsistencies between underlying zoning regulations and the shoreline master program, the shoreline regulations prevail.

h. Has any part of the site been classified as an "environmentally sensitive" area? If so, specify.

Parts of the city are classified as environmentally sensitive. This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?

The proposal is a non-project action.

j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?

The proposal is not site-specific and therefore is not expected to result in displacement of people from existing housing.

k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and project land uses and plans, if any:

The proposed Land Use Code amendment has been reviewed for consistency with Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Policies and adopted neighborhood plans. The primary purpose of the proposed amendments is ongoing maintenance of the Land Use Code and to propose minor amendments.

9. Housing

No additional units are expected as a result of implementing the proposed amendments.

10. Aesthetics

- a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?**

The proposal is not site-specific and does not apply to any particular structure.

- b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?**

The proposal is not site-specific.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:**

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

11. Light and Glare

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

12. Recreation

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

13. Historic and Cultural Preservation

- a. Are there any places or objects listed on, or proposed for, national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe.**

This proposal is not site-specific. Historic places and objects eligible for national, state, or local registers are located throughout Seattle.

- b. Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site.**

This proposal is not site-specific. Landmarks and cultural facilities are located throughout Seattle.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts, if any:**

None of the proposed amendments is expected to impact historic/landmark structures. Individual projects will undergo SEPA review, as required. All future development is required to comply with local, state, and national regulations that require mitigation of impacts on historic and cultural resources.

14. Transportation

- a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site, and describe the proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.**

The city is well-served by an urban street system and street classification system.

- b. Is site currently served by public transit? If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?**

The proposal is not site-specific. The City is currently well-served by King County Metro and Sound Transit bus service and by Sound Transit regional commuter rail facilities.

- c. How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate?**

This is not a site-specific proposal. However, future development proposals throughout the city will meet the applicable parking requirements under the existing code. Projects and development consistent with this proposal will occur over time and cannot be evaluated in terms of parking impacts at this stage.

- d. Will the proposal require any new roads or streets, or improvements to existing roads or streets, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).**

The proposal is not site-specific. No new roads or streets or street improvements will be required as a result of implementing the proposed amendments.

- e. **Will the project use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.**

This proposal is not site-specific.

- f. **How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur.**

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Future development projects will be subject to environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review for traffic and transportation impacts), and will need to meet transportation concurrency requirements.

- g. **Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any.**

See 14 c. above.

15. Public Services

- a. **Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.**

No new public services would be required.

- b. **Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.**

Please see (B) (15) (a) above.

16. Utilities

- a. **Utilities currently available at the site: electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other.**

The proposed amendments are a non-project action. . Individual projects developed pursuant to this proposal would be served by utilities including electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, and sanitary sewer.

- b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in immediate vicinity which might be needed.**

In general, utility providers, including Seattle City Light, Seattle Public Utilities, Washington Natural Gas, U.S. West, and other utilities regularly review the effects of increased development and propose enhanced services as necessary as part of their planning for future service needs. This proposal will not create the need for additional utility services.

C. Signature

Signature provided following section D below.

D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS

(Do not use this sheet for project actions)

Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of the elements of the environment.

When answering these questions, be aware of the extent the proposal or the types of activities likely to result from the proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a faster rate than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.

1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?

The proposed amendments would not affect discharges to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise. Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions have also been considered, and no changes to GHG emissions are expected as a result of this non-project action. Individual projects that may use the land use and zoning provisions of the proposal will occur over time and cannot be evaluated in terms of discharge to water, emissions to air, production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances, or noise, at this stage. Such projects will be subject to environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review) as they move forward.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

No proposed measures are proposed beyond existing regulations at this time because the proposal does not involve any construction or development activity. A SEPA GHG Emissions Worksheet is required for all individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal. Any potential impacts from GHG emissions will be addressed during review of development proposals on a project-specific basis.

2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life?

Enactment of the proposed amendments is unlikely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life. The area is developed and urban in character. The proposal does not alter existing protections to plants, animals, fish or marine life.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life are:

No measures are proposed beyond existing regulations at this time because the proposal does not involve any construction or development activity. The City and other regulatory agencies have existing regulations to protect these resources.

3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?

The proposed amendments would not affect energy or natural resources.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are:

No measures to protect or conserve energy are proposed beyond existing regulations at this time because the proposal does not involve any construction or development activity.

4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands?

The proposed ordinance would not affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated for government protection.

Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are:

No resource protection measures are proposed beyond existing regulations at this time because the proposal does not involve any construction or development activity.

5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?

No incompatible uses would be allowed or encouraged by these amendments. No site-specific proposals are proposed at this time.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and use impacts are:

No resource protection measures are proposed beyond existing regulations at this time because the proposal does not involve any construction or development activity. Future development projects will be subject to design review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review), which will help mitigate the impacts of height, bulk, and scale for new developments on existing buildings.

6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?

The proposed ordinance would not affect transportation or public services.

Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are:

In general, providers of utilities and public services, including fire protection, police protection, health care, schools regularly review the effects of increased development and propose enhanced services as necessary as part of their planning for future service needs. Future site-specific development projects will need to meet the City's concurrency requirements for transportation, utilities, and public services infrastructure. As the proposal does not involve any construction or development activity, no specific measures are practicable at this stage.

7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.

No conflicts are anticipated.

SIGNATURE:

I, the undersigned, state that to the best of my knowledge the above information is true and complete. It is understood that the lead agency may withdraw any declaration of non-significance that it might issue in reliance upon this checklist should there be any willful misrepresentation or willful lack of full disclosure on my part.

(signature on file)
William K. Mills
Senior Land Use Planner

September 2, 2010
Date

This checklist was reviewed by:

(signature on file)
Planner, City of Seattle
Department of Planning and Development

September 2, 2010
Date